SUFFOLK COUNTY WATER QUALITY PROTECTION AND RESTORATION PROGRAM

APPLICATION FORM

I. APPLICATION FORM

Part 1 – Applicant Information

1. Application Number (leave blank - will be assigned by SCWQRC)

2. Applicant Name

3. Federal Taxpayer ID#

4. Phone Fax Email

5. Mailing Address
No. & Street
City
Zip Code

6. Contact Person and Title

7. Contact Mailing Address and Information (if different from applicant)
No. & Street
City
Zip Code Phone

Part 2 – Project Information

1. Project Name

2. Project Location/Address

3. Suffolk County Tax Map Number(s)

4. Project Type

☐ Nonpoint Source Abatement and Control – Remediation
☐ Other Nonpoint Source Pollution Remediation
☐ Nonpoint Source Abatement and Control – Preservation
☐ No-Discharge Zone Implementation
☐ Aquatic Habitat Restoration
☐ Education and Outreach
☐ Agricultural Nonpoint Source Abatement and Control
☐ Pollution Prevention Initiatives

Part 3 - Project Costs

Planning	$	Engineering	$
Construction & Construction Inspection	$	Monitoring	$
Other*	$	Land Acquisition	$

*Specify_____

Total Funds Requested $

Part 4 - Project Description

Provide a brief general description of the proposed project. Include all required information as specified in *Section IV – Instructions for Completing Application Form*. Attach preliminary plan or additional sheets if applicable.

Part 5 – Community Support

Identify community groups that are in favor or against the project. Include letters of support if available.

Group Name	For or Against?

Part 6 - Other Funding Sources

- Local $ _____ Include municipal resolution if available.
- State $ _____ Name_____
- Federal $ _____ Name_____
- Other $ _____ Name_____

Part 7 - Documentation of Impairment and Need

Provide documentation illustrating the need to implement this project. Refer to *Section IV – Instructions for Completing Application Form* for examples.

Part 8 - Project Readiness

1. What is the SEQRA classification for this project? ☐ Type I ☐ Type II ☐ Unlisted

2. Has the SEQRA process been initiated? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not applicable

3. Has a lead agency been designated? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not applicable
   If yes, specify lead agency:

4. Has the lead agency made a determination of significance? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not applicable
   If yes, specify determination:

   Specify date of determination:

5. Will the project require permits? ☐ Yes ☐ No

   If yes, specify permit type and permitting agency:

Agency	Type	Approved? (y/n)

6. What stage of planning has been completed for this project?

Part 9– Project Personnel

Identify the name, title, and qualifications of the individuals who will participate in project implementation. Include curriculum vitae of participating staff if possible. Be sure to identify a Project Manager who will provide project supervision.

Part 10 – Project Schedule

Milestone	Date
♦ Project Start	
♦ Project Complete	

Part 11 – Enforcement Status

1. Is the municipality under enforcement to construct the project? ☐ Yes ☐ No

   If yes, include a copy of the enforcement instrument.

Part 12 – Certification

I hereby certify under penalty of perjury that information provided on this form and attached statements and exhibits is true to the best of my knowledge and belief. False statements made herein are punishable as a Class A misdemeanor pursuant to Section 210.45 of the Penal Law.

Official Designee (print name)	Title
Signature	Date

II. PROJECT SCORING SYSTEM

The parameters followed by a "PWL" in the *Environmental Significance of Proposal* section of Parts IA and IB below are identified explicitly in "The 2000 Atlantic Ocean, Long Island Sound Basin Waterbody Inventory and Priority Waterbodies List" (NYSDEC, April 2002). Specific waterbody information from this report will be available upon request from the Suffolk County Department of Public Works by calling Georgette Morfis at 631-852-4116.

Part IA – Nonpoint Source Abatement and Control – Remediation Projects
Apply to agricultural and non-agricultural nonpoint source abatement and control projects that remediate existing pollution.

Environmental Significance of Proposal 50 Max

1) Impairment level of affected waterbody (PWL) 6 Max
   a) Precluded 6
      Frequent or persistent water quality conditions prevent all aspects of the waterbody use.
   b) Impaired 4
      Occasional water quality conditions prevent the use of the waterbody.
   c) Stressed 3
      Occasional water quality conditions periodically discourage the use of the waterbody.
   d) Threatened 1
      Water quality currently supports waterbody uses, but existing or changing land use patterns may result in restricted use.
   e) None 0
      Water quality currently supports all waterbody uses and no threat is in the foreseeable future.

SCORE:_____

2) Waterbody Classification (PWL) 6 Max
   a) A, SA, GA, AA special 6
      Specially protected high quality drinking water and shellfish waters
   b) A, A special, GA (other), GSA 5
      Other drinking water
   c) B, SB, C(T), C(TS) 4
      Contact recreation, trout and trout propagation
   d) C, SC, I 3
      Other fishing
   e) D, SD, GSB 2
      Other water uses

SCORE:_____

3) Targeted pollutant and existing source of pollutant (PWL) 6 Max
   a) Primary pollutant-primary source 6
      I.e. Pathogens – Urban Runoff
   b) Primary pollutant-secondary source 4
      I.e. Pathogens – Boat pollution
   c) Secondary pollutant-primary source 3

I.e. Silt/sediment – Urban runoff

d) Secondary pollutant-secondary source 2
I.e. Silt/sediment - Hydromodification

SCORE:_____

4) Targeted problem documentation (PWL) 10 Max

a) Known 10
Water quality monitoring data and/or studies have been completed and conclude that the use of the waterbody is restricted to the degree indicated by the listed severity.

b) Suspected 5
Reasonably strong evidence suggests the use of the waterbody is impacted. However, water quality data/studies that establish an impact have not been completed or there is conflicting information.

c) Possible 1
Anecdotal evidence, public perception and/or specific citizen complaints indicate that the use of the waterbody may be restricted. However, there is currently very little, if any, documentation of an actual water quality problem.

SCORE:_____

5) Problem resolution potential (PWL) 10 Max
Reflects the degree to which the expenditure of available funds and resources on the waterbody is appropriate. Factors include the degree of public interest and whether measurable results can be reasonably achieved with the funds requested.

a) High 10
b) Medium 5
c) Low 1

SCORE:_____

6) Project size 6 Max

a) >15 acres 6
b) 10 to 15 acres 4
c) 5 to 10 acres 3
d) 0 to 5 acres 2

SCORE:_____

Other Considerations 6 Max

7) Community and User Group Support 2 Max

a) Significant support 2
One or more groups (other than that nominating the project) have voiced support or endorsed the proposed project

b) No opposition 0
No support or opposition evident regarding the proposed restoration, or comparable opposition and support.

c) Significant opposition -2
Strong opposition by one or more groups or individuals which could likely delay or prevent the proposed project from being initiated or completed.

SCORE:_____

8) Post Project maintenance	4 Max
a) No maintenance required	4
b) Minor maintenance required	2
c) Major maintenance required	0

SCORE:_____

PART IA TOTAL SCORE:_____

Part IB – Nonpoint Source Abatement and Control - Preservation Projects

Apply to agricultural and non-agricultural nonpoint source abatement and control projects and pollution prevention initiatives that prevent potential pollution and/or preserve water quality.

Environmental Significance of Proposal 50 Max

1) Impairment level of affected waterbody (PWL) 8 Max
   a) None 8
      Water quality currently supports all waterbody uses and no threat is in the foreseeable future.
   b) Threatened 6
      Water quality currently supports waterbody uses, but existing or changing land use patterns may result in restricted use.
   c) Stressed 4
      Occasional water quality conditions periodically discourage the use of the waterbody.
   d) Impaired 2
      Occasional water quality conditions prevent the use of the waterbody.
   e) Precluded 0
      Frequent or persistent water quality conditions prevent all aspects of the waterbody use.

SCORE:_____

2) Waterbody Classification (PWL) 8 Max
   a) A, SA, GA, AA special 8
      Specially protected high quality drinking water and shellfish waters
   b) A, A special, GA (other), GSA 6
      Other drinking water
   c) B, SB, C(T), C(TS) 4
      Contact recreation, trout and trout propagation
   d) C, SC, I 2
      Other fishing
   e) D, SD, GSB 0
      Other water uses

SCORE:_____

3) Targeted problem documentation (PWL) 10 Max
   a) Known 10
      Water quality monitoring data and/or studies have been completed and conclude that the use of the waterbody is restricted to the degree indicated by the listed severity.
   b) Suspected 5
      Reasonably strong evidence suggests the use of the waterbody is impacted. However, water quality data/studies that establish an impact have not been completed or there is conflicting information.
   c) Possible 1

Anecdotal evidence, public perception and/or specific citizen complaints indicate that the use of the waterbody may be restricted. However, there is currently very little, if any, documentation of an actual water quality problem.

SCORE:_____

4) Problem resolution potential (PWL) 10 Max

Reflects the degree to which the expenditure of available funds and resources on the waterbody is appropriate. Factors include the degree of public interest and whether measurable results can be reasonably achieved with the funds requested.

a) High 10
b) Medium 5
c) Low 1

SCORE:_____

5) Project size 8 Max

a) >15 acres 8
b) 10 to 15 acres 6
c) 5 to 10 acres 4
d) 0 to 5 acres 2

SCORE:_____

Other Considerations 6 Max

6) Community and User Group Support 2 max

a) Significant support 2
One or more groups (other than that nominating the project) have voiced support or endorsed the proposed project

b) No opposition 0
No support or opposition evident regarding the proposed restoration

c) Significant opposition -2
Strong opposition by one or more groups or individuals which could likely delay or prevent the proposed project from being initiated or completed.

SCORE:_____

7) Post Project maintenance 4 max

a) No maintenance required 4
b) Minor maintenance required 2
c) Major maintenance required 0

SCORE:_____

PART IB TOTAL SCORE:_____

Part IC – Aquatic Habitat Restoration Projects

Apply to aquatic habitat restoration projects categorized by Section 12-2(A)(2) of the Suffolk County Charter (see Appendix IV).

Environmental Significance of Proposal 50 Max

Ecological Considerations (35 points)

1) Level of Degradation 12 max
   a) Severe 12
      There is little or no ecological function at the site for the habitat to be restored (e.g., 3 feet or more of dredge spoil on a former salt marsh).
   b) Medium 6
      There is limited ecological function at the site for the habitat to be restored (e.g., formerly connected salt marsh).
   c) Low 2
      The ecological functions of the site are present, but the habitat could be enhanced.

SCORE:_____

2) Proposed Project Size 5 max
   a) 0 to 3 acres 1
   b) 3 to 10 acres 2
   c) 10 to 50 acres 4
   d) > 50 acres 5

SCORE:_____

3) Habitat Contiguity/Adjacent Land Use 9 max
   a) Complete contiguity with protected area 9
   b) Partial contiguity with protected area 8
   c) Complete contiguity with undeveloped area 5
   d) Partial contiguity with undeveloped area 3
   e) No contiguous habitat 0

SCORE:_____

4) Target Restoration Functions (additive) 5 max
   a) Nutrient retention 1
      Proposed restoration will contribute to a reduction in or assimilation of nutrients.
   b) Species diversity 1
      Proposed restoration will increase species diversity.
   c) Groundwater protection 1
      Proposed restoration will aid in groundwater recharge or contaminant abatement.
   d) Food chain support 1
      Proposed restoration will contribute or enable to transfer of energy into a food chain.
   e) Fish/wildlife corridor 1

Proposed restoration will facilitate the movement of fish/wildlife through the site.

SCORE:_____

5) Promotes habitat diversity in the landscape — 4 max
   a) Yes — 4
   The proposed restoration will increase or maintain habitat types that are being degraded or lost in the region.

SCORE:_____

Other Considerations — 15 max

6) Ownership — 5 max
   a) Public — 5
   b) Private/acquired (e.g., The Nature Conservancy, Peconic Land Trust) — 4
   c) Private/easement — 3
   d) Private/no protection — 0

SCORE:_____

7) Current Stage of Planning — 4 max
   a) Planning completed — 4
   b) Planning underway — 2
   No surveys or written plans have been completed.

SCORE:_____

8) Community and User Group Support — 2 max
   a) Significant support — 2
   One or more groups (other than that nominating the site) have voiced support or endorsed the proposed project
   b) No opposition — 0
   No support or opposition evident regarding the proposed restoration
   c) Significant opposition — -2
   Strong opposition by one or more groups or individuals which could likely delay or prevent the proposed project from being initiated or completed.

SCORE:_____

9) Post Project maintenance — 4 max
   a) No maintenance required — 4
   b) Minor maintenance required — 2
   c) Major maintenance required — 0

SCORE:_____

PART IC TOTAL SCORE:_____

Part ID – Projects To Implement No-Discharge Zones

Apply to no-discharge zone implementation projects categorized by Section 12-2(A)(2) of the Suffolk County Charter (see Appendix IV). Projects to implement vessel waste no-discharge zones can be divided into two categories; reimbursement for pump-out systems and feasibility studies for no-discharge zone designation.

A) Reimbursement Program for Pump-Out Systems

For the purposes of this program, a "Pump-Out System" is defined as a pump-out boat or a stationary land-based system.

Proposal Significance 50 Max

I. Minimum Guidelines

1) The specific area(s) of use must be indicated: bays, harbors, and permanent pump-out boat dock locations, etc. (GIS map, nautical chart, or Hagstrom map acceptable)

2) The need for the requested pump-out system must be clearly conveyed. A site-specific analysis must be done, including number of pump outs available, boats served by existing pump outs, boats to be served by proposed pump outs, etc.

3) Water quality benefits must be discussed (*e.g.*, need for pollution reduction, or water quality preservation)

4) An estimate of the operation and maintenance costs, and the ability and commitment to support those costs
   a) Prior commitments to similar programs should be included
   b) Plans and commitment for education, outreach, signage, pamphlets, etc. should be discussed
   c) The mechanism(s) for final disposal of the wastes collected should be discussed

5) A commitment to provide an annual report, for a minimum of five years. Annual reports should discuss:
   a) number of boats serviced
   b) gallons pumped
   c) operational difficulties
   d) methods of final disposal
   e) strategies for future

6) Provide technical specifications of the pump out system(s) requested, to the extent that they are available, along with a summary of why a specific vessel, or manufacturer, was selected.

7) Detailed budget including match (a minimum of 50% municipality match is required)

8) List of personnel to be assigned to the program, with a CV of no more than 2 pages per person.

Note: If all minimum guidelines are met then award 50 points. If all minimum guidelines are not met, award 0 points.

B) Vessel Waste No-discharge Zone Feasibility Study

Proposal Significance 50 Max

I. Minimum Guidelines

1) Letter(s) from the New York State Department of State and/or New York State Department of Environmental Conservation evidencing state support, participation, cooperation, or other state sanction.

2) Letters of commitment form the local towns and villages in which the proposed waterbody is located.

Note: If all minimum guidelines are met then award 50 points. If all minimum guidelines are not met, award 0 points.

PART ID TOTAL SCORE:_____

Part IE – Educational Outreach Projects

Apply to educational outreach projects categorized by Section 12-2(A)(2) of the Suffolk County Charter (see appendix IV).

Proposal Significance - Public Education and Outreach Projects 50 Max

I. Minimum Guidelines

- Enhances public involvement in water quality protection and habitat restoration efforts
- Contains a mechanism for oversight that assures that the information presented is technically correct, objective, and balanced
- Project is recurring and/or sustainable, or is a one-time event designed to reach a significant number of residents
- Shows clear relationship to an environmental management issue as highlighted in an Estuary Program or other credible information
- Not merely educational - has clear goals with tangible environmental benefits

Note: If all minimum guidelines are met then award 50 points. If all minimum guidelines are not met, award 0 points.

PART IE TOTAL SCORE:_____

Part II - Programmatic Significance (50 points max)
Apply to project types 1-5 as shown in Table 1.

1. Implements a specific estuary management plan recommendation……. 50
   Identify recommendation as quoted in the Comprehensive Management Plan (provide page no.):

2. Part of an integrated subwatershed approach, consistent with a general estuary program recommendation…… 40

3. Individual project, consistent with a general estuary program recommendation……. 30

4. Not consistent with a general estuary program recommendation……. 0

PART II TOTAL SCORE:_____

Part III - Proposal-Specific Adjustment Factor (0 to 1)
To be used only by Water Quality Review Committee for all project types.

a. Technical soundness/likelihood of success in achieving objectives…… 0 to 20

SCORE:_____

b. Cost effectiveness (cost vs. benefit)……..…. 0 to 20

SCORE:_____

c. Experience/training of applicant……. 0 to 20

SCORE:_____

d. Capability to administer program and monitor for effectiveness of success…… 0 to 20

SCORE:_____

e. Match / leveraged resources (50% match = 20 points, 25% match = 10 points)…….. 0 to 20

SCORE:_____

TOTAL Proposal-Specific Adjustment Factor = (a+b+c+d+e)/100

PART III TOTAL SCORE:_____

PROJECT SCORING SUMMARY

1. Nonpoint Source Abatement and Control – Remediation

   a. Part IA: ☐ Total Score ((a+b)*c):

   b. Part II: ☐ ☐

   c. Part III: ☐

2. Nonpoint Source Abatement and Control – Preservation

   a. Part IB: ☐ Total Score = ((a+b)*c):

   b. Part II: ☐ ☐

   c. Part III: ☐

3. Aquatic Habitat Restoration

   a. Part IC: ☐ Total Score = ((a+b)*c):

   b. Part II: ☐ ☐

   c. Part III: ☐

4. Agricultural Nonpoint Source Abatement and Control

   a. Part IA or IB: ☐ Total Score = ((a+b)*c):

   b. Part II: ☐ ☐

   c. Part III: ☐

5. Pollution Prevention Initiatives

   a. Part IB: ☐ Total Score = ((a+b)*c):

   b. Part II: ☐ ☐

   c. Part III: ☐

6. Projects to Implement No-Discharge Zones

   a. Part ID: ☐ Total Score = (2a*b): ☐

   b. Part III: ☐

7. Programs for Education and Outreach

   a. Part IE: ☐ Total Score = (2a*b): ☐

   b. Part III: ☐

8. Other Nonpoint Source Pollution Remediation

   a. Part IA: Total Score = (2a*b): ☐

   b. Part III: